

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignita 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/556,777	04/25/2000	Akira Goda	0039-7692-2S	8088	
7	590 09/03/2003	·			
OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER NEUSTADT			EXAMINER		
1755 JEFFERS ARLINGTON,	ON DAVIS HIGHWAY VA 22202		SOWARD	SOWARD, IDA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			DATE MAILED: 09/03/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

, · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/556,777	GODA ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Ida M Soward	2822				
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess			
THE REPLY FILED 19 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	i.			
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		dered but does NOT	place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly			
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>26-68</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 6-10 and 1	<u>5-18</u> .					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. ☐ Other:						
	SUPERV TECH	AMIR ZARABIAN ISORY PATENT EXAMI INULUSY CENTER 280	NER 90			

prix

Continuation of 5. does NOT plac the application in condition for allowance because: Lee does disclose an insulating film 34 being oxidized (col. 4, line 2. Tottori does disclose an insulating film 2, which contains silicon nitride, being harder for an oxidizing agent to pass therethrough, compared with a silicon oxide film (col. 11, lines 45-55). In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, motivation to do so is found either in the Lee reference (col. 3, lines 66-67).